-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 December 2000_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   18)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

16)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   19)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   20)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 12/13/00 to the

application filed on 10/28/98.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16 are independent

claims.

3.   The objection of figure 11 as including elements which are not disclosed in the

specification has been withdrawn in view of the drawing correction.

4.   The objection of the specification as being included informalities has been

withdrawn in view of amendment.

Drawings

5.   This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for

examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is

allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
>
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
>
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
>
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was

made.

7.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior

art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8.   Claims 1-2, 6-7, 16-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Syeda-Mahmood (US Pat No. 5,983,218, 11/9/99) in view of Torres

et al. (US Pat No. 5,897,635, 4/27/99).

Regarding independent claim 16, Syeda-Mahmood discloses:

- accessing and rendering media from multimedia files in a data repository (the
  multimedia database is designed so that user can access the data by posing a query
  via *interactive dialogue between the web client and multimedia database* to retrieve
  (or render) the desired data, col 4, lines 4-30))

- limiting access to preselected media files (the search engine checks the consistency
  among the *retrieved* information to *eliminate duplicate information*, the duplicate
  information shows that the information is preselected and eliminating this information
  to limit access to the preselected files (col 6, lines 52-55; col 7, lines 60-67))

Syeda does not disclose the program code for accessing and rendering media code

from multimedia files in a data repository as well as software modules providing

functionality for an Interactive Multimedia Application (IMA) and the *Interactive*

Multimedia Viewer (IMV). However, since Syeda provides the *interactive dialogue for*

accessing and rendering multimedia data, such dialogue in the user interface is

considered equivalent to the *Interactive Multimedia* Viewer. Since Syeda discloses that

feature, it implies Syeda program includes related software modules as well as

associated codes to perform the functions.

Syeda does not disclose the editing of the editable layer of at least one IMV and the

joining of selected and edited modules to form the IMV.

Torres discloses:

- a customized user interface that allows a user to edit, update and manipulate the

  multimedia application information (col 3, lines 9-23, figures 3-5)

- joining the selected and edited modules to form the IMA (col 3, lines 20-33, col 4,

  lines 10-67), and also

- accessing and rendering media files from the repository (col 4, lines 10-55)

Torres does not use the same terminology: the editable layer of at least one the

Interactive Multimedia Viewer (IMV). However, the customized user interface CUI in

Torres where a user can access, render, and edit media files from the database

repository as disclosed above shows the same function of editing media information

(e.g...fax, mail) and joining the selected and edited information to form a IMA through

an interface as that of the editable layer of the Interactive Multimedia Viewer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Torres into Syeda to obtain the editing feature in combination with the features of the Interactive Multimedia Viewer which only allows a user to access and render the multimedia information from the database repository.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, as in claim 16, Syeda discloses a user interface for database site selection (col 4, lines 19-30).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have utilized Syeda. The fact that Syeda provides an interactive dialogue, which is an interface, for selecting database, implies that the associated software and modules should be included.

Independent claim 1 is an object-oriented programming interface to perform the method of claim 16, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, is software module comprising one software interface to perform the method of claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 6 is a programming application to perform the method disclosed in claim 16, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, is a programming application to perform the method of claim 17, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

9.   Claims 3-5, 8-10, 11-12, 13-15, 18-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Syeda-Mahmood and Torres as applied to claim 16 above, and

further in view of Goetz et al. (US Pat No. 5,956,729, 9/21/99).

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, Syeda and Torres do not disclose

that the IMV is adapted to access and render multimedia code of only one type. Goetz

discloses that an application may support several instances of a particular media type

(col 3, lines 2-11).

Even though Goetz fails to mention of the code for accessing and rendering of

multimedia files, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention was made to have included Goetz to Syeda and Torres. The fact that

Goetz shows the supporting of several instances of a particular media type implies that

Goetz includes that type of code to perform such function.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 16, Syeda and Torres do not disclose

that the IMV is adapted to access and render multimedia code of more than one type.

Goetz discloses that the invention includes a multimedia file for organizing at least one

type of media on a computer-readable medium, such as a CD Rom, hard disk, or the

like. The multimedia file is capable of storing and identifying multiple instances of at

least one media type (col 3, lines 18-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have incorporated Goetz to Syeda and Torres since Goetz further

provides the access and rendering a multimedia file of at least one type, which means

one type or more than one type of media.

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 16, Syeda and Torres do not disclose

that the multimedia files stored in the data repository represent multimedia transactions,

and are characterized with tags *according to one or more of* date, time, participants, file

type; company affiliation of participants, subject or issue, and relationship to other

multimedia files.

Goetz discloses:

- ■ multimedia files stored in the data repository represent multimedia transactions (col

  11, lines 21-38)

- ■ file type of a multimedia file (col 11, lines 26-38)

Goetz does not explicitly disclose the tags that characterize multimedia files as claimed.

However, the MIME type in Goetz using to *specify the type* of a multimedia file. This

shows that the MIME extension included in the URL, as a tag, *characterizes the type* of

the multimedia file.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have incorporated Goetz to Syeda and Torres to obtain details of

multimedia files stored in the repository wherein the multimedia files include multimedia

transactions, have tags for representation of information according one or more of date,

time, participant, file type, etc, in addition to the feature of accessing, rendering, and

editing multimedia files as mentioned above.

Claims 3-5 are IMV software modules to perform the method of claims 18-20, and are

rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 8-10 is a programming application to perform the method of claims 18-20, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 11 is for a multimedia communication center which includes the limitations of claim 6, the storage system for recording multimedia file (rejected in claim 20), and the access interface (Torres, col 1, lines 39-48; col 2, lines 5-34), therefore is rejected under the same rationale applied to these claims.

Claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, comprising software interfaces disclosed and rejected in claim 17 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 13-15 is a multimedia communication center including the IMV disclosed in the method of claims 18-20, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filed 12/13/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Syeda does not disclose:

■ selecting software modules providing functionality for an Interactive Multimedia Application including at least one selectable Interactive Multimedia Viewer software module having a code set for accessing and rendering media code from the multimedia files stored in a data repository, and

■ an editable layer allowing the programmer to program limitations limiting access by
  the IMV to preselected media files

Examiner agrees that Syeda does not disclose such a software module as well as the

multimedia code for accessing and rendering media files. However, Syeda does provide

the *interactive dialogue for accessing and rendering multimedia data*, such dialogue in

the user interface is considered equivalent to the *Interactive Multimedia* Viewer. Since

Syeda discloses that feature, it *implies Syeda program includes related software*

modules as well as associated codes to perform the functions.

Syeda discloses limiting access to preselected media files (col 6, lines 52-55; col 7,

lines 60-67). The fact that the search engine checks the consistency among the

retrieved information to *eliminate duplicate information* shows that feature since the

duplicate information implies that the information is preselected, and now selected again

with the same information, and eliminating this information shows limiting access to the

preselected files.

Applicants argue that Goetz does not teach the tags that characterize multimedia files

according to one or more of date, time, participants, file type, company affiliation of

participants, etc.

Goetz discloses the file type of a multimedia file (col 11, lines 26-38). Though Goetz

does not explicitly disclose the tag that characterize a multimedia file as claimed, Goetz

does disclose the MIME type using to specify the type of a multimedia file. This shows

that the MIME extension included in the URL, as a tag, characterizes the type of the

multimedia file.

Applicants uses the language "*according one or more of* date, time, participants, file

type; company affiliation of participants, subject or issue, and relationship to other

multimedia files..." Goetz shows that a multimedia file is characterized with tags

according to *one required feature* which is the file type.

Conclusion

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM

to 4:30 PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to

this Art Unit is (703) 308-5403.

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

        Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

        Washington, D.C. 20231

                or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5403   (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

clh

3/30/01